



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/721,363	11/22/2000	Jari Suutarinen	796.377USW1	6589

22865 7590 11/05/2002

ALTERA LAW GROUP, LLC  
6500 CITY WEST PARKWAY  
SUITE 100  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55344-7704

EXAMINER

LEE, JOHN J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2682

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/721,363

Applicant(s)

SUUTARINEN, JARI

Examiner

JOHN J LEE

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1 –13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanmugam (US Patent number 5,978,669) in view of Stephenson et al. (US Patent number 6,119,000).

Regarding **claim 1**, Sanmugam discloses that a method of trace activation in a communications system, wherein a station is in communication with a mobile communications network, the method comprising the steps of:

directing a communication from the mobile station to a predefined trace activation number of tracing facility (Fig. 11, 13, 17 and column 24, lines 61 – column 28, lines 43).

activating tracing at the tracing facility for the mobile station from which the communication originates; (Fig. 11, 13, 17, column 24, lines 61 – column 28, lines 43, and column 19, lines 15 – column 20, lines 36).

Sanmugam does not specifically disclose the limitation “generating a trace report for the mobile station”. However, Stephenson discloses the limitation “generating a trace report for the mobile station” (Fig. 9 and column 14, lines 26 – column 15, lines 50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to modify Sanmugam system as taught by Stephenson. Doing so would enhance the call connection reliability in mobile communication system.

Regarding **claim 2**, Sanmugam and Stephenson disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claim 1. Furthermore, Sanmugam further discloses that deactivating tracing when the call is ended (Fig. 11, 13, 17 and column 24, lines 61 – column 28, lines 43).

Regarding **claim 3**, Sanmugam and Stephenson disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claim 1.

Regarding **claim 4**, Sanmugam discloses that deactivating tracing when a preset time period is elapsed (Fig. 11, 13, 17 and column 24, lines 61 – column 28, lines 43).

Regarding **claim 5**, Sanmugam discloses that deactivating tracing when a second message from the mobile station is directed to the predefined trace activation number (Fig. 11, 13, 17 and column 24, lines 61 – column 28, lines 43).

Regarding **claim 6**, Sanmugam and Stephenson disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claim 1.

Regarding **claim 7**, Sanmugam and Stephenson disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 2.

Regarding **claim 8**, Sanmugam discloses that the communication is forwarded to the predefined trace activation number (Fig. 11, 13, 17 and column 24, lines 61 – column 28, lines 43).

Regarding **claim 9**, Sanmugam discloses that tracing is activated and deactivated automatically at the switching center (Fig. 11, 13, 17 and column 24, lines 61 – column 28, lines 43).

Regarding **claim 10**, Sanmugam and Stephenson disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claim 1.

Regarding **claim 11**, Sanmugam and Stephenson disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claim 1.

Regarding **claim 12**, Sanmugam and Stephenson disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claim 1. Furthermore, Sanmugam further discloses that a communications network with which said at least one mobile station is arranged to communicate (Fig. 1, 4, 11).

Regarding **claim 13**, Sanmugam and Stephenson disclose all the limitation, as discussed in claims 1 and 12. Sanmugam further discloses means for receiving said communication (Fig. 1, 4, 11, 17 and column 24, lines 61 – column 28, lines 43).

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Arinell (US Patent number 5,694,451) discloses Method and an Arrangement for Performance Monitoring in a Telecommunications Network.

Rune (US Patent number 6,181,940) discloses Location Area Scheme Negotiation in Communications System.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:


(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal  
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
examiner should be directed to **John J. Lee** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5936**.  
He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 8:30am-5:00  
pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Vivian  
Chin**, can be reached on **(703) 308-6739**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to  
the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone  
number is (703) 305-4700.

J.L  
October 30, 2002

John J Lee

  
**VIVIAN CHIN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**

11/2/02